

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In paragraph 1 of the Action, it was noted that a certified copy of priority 10-264678 has not been filed.

However, applicant respectfully request the Examiner to direct attention to that this application is CIP application based upon prior applications 09/383,932 and 09/383,933, which have foreign priority 10-264678 and 10-264679, respectively, and a certified copy of priority 10-264678 was filed on September 19, 2000 for application No. 09/383,932. Accordingly, it is believed that no more certified copy thereof is required.

In paragraph 2 of the Action, an IDS for the references in the specification was required.

In reply thereto, applicant hereby submits an IDS with the required fee in the amount of \$180.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the abstract was objected to because of the use of legal phraseology.

In reply thereto, applicant hereby submits a new abstract, in which "comprising" is deleted.

In paragraph 4 of the Action, claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended claim 12 in endeavor to meet the requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In paragraph 5 of the Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 10, and 16 were rejected under the judicially doctrine obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, and 12-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,595.

In reply thereto, applicant hereby submits a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.32 (c) with

Art Unit: 2836

the required fee in the amount of \$110 and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof by the Examiner.

In paragraph 6 of the Action, claims 1-4, 10, 11, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opie, US 4,758,742 in view of the teaching of Normann, US 4,639,670.

In reply thereto, applicant has canceled claims 1-4, 10, 11, and 15. Accordingly, applicant has amended claims 5, 12-14, and 16, which are dependent upon any of canceled claims 4, 11, and 15, to make them independent claims.

In paragraph 7 of the Action, claims 6-9, and 17-20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended claims 6, 7, 9, 17, 18, and 20 to overcome the objection.

The number of independent claims is now nine and the required fee for independent claims in excess of three in the amount of \$516 is enclosed.

A shortened statutory period for reply ends December 25, 2003. However, the Patent and Trademark Office were closed on December 25 and 26 and, therefore, no extension fee is necessary.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, claims 5-9, 12-14, and 16-20 allowed, and this case passed to issue.

Application Number: 09/995,758

page 11

Art Unit: 2836

Respectfully submitted,


Satoru Takeuchi

Reg. No. 53,670

Agent for Applicant

Date: 12/29/03

KANESAKA & TAKEUCHI
1423 Powhatan Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel.: (703) 519-9785